

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner rejected claims 26-30, 32, 38, 41, 63-66, 71, 74, and 89 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang. The Examiner also rejected claims 31, 34-37, 39-40, 42-62, 67-70, 72-73, and 75-88 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, either alone or in view of Taylor or in view of Siew. Such rejections are respectfully traversed, particularly as to the claims as amended. The claims as amended require a *single* banner which is *directly* attached to the cylinder which forms the support. In contrast, Chang teaches multiple banners, each of which is attached to a lamp reflector which is then concentrically attached to the support. Further, in all of the embodiments of Chang, lamp reflectors **12**, which are coated with electroplated layer **16**, obscure the illumination of the support along substantially the entire support, or, in the embodiment of Fig. 5, along substantial portions of the support which are surrounded by lamp reflectors **12**. The claims have been amended to require that illumination of the support is visible along substantially the entire length of the support. Therefore Chang does not anticipate, since it does not teach every element of the cited claims. See, e.g., *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."). Further, because neither Chang nor the other art cited in combination with Chang disclose a single banner directly attached to the support, all claim limitations have not been taught or suggested by the combinations of the cited art, which is required for establishing *prima facie* obviousness per MPEP Section 2143.03.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Philip D. Askenazy, Reg. No. 56,721
Direct line: (505) 998-6132

PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927

Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\AMDS\Odyssey Lighting\Lighted Flagpole OAR 2-28-06.doc